

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification, rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,579 (“the ‘579 patent”), and rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,593,047 (“Moon”).

Applicants greatly appreciate the courtesy extended by the Examiner in granting an interview with Applicants’ representatives on March 5, 2007.

By this reply, claims 8-10 have been canceled without prejudice, claims 1-7 have been amended, and new claims 11-18 have been added. Claims 1-7 and 11-18 are pending in the above-captioned patent application.

With respect to the objections to the specification, Applicants have amended the specification to indicate that U.S. Application No. 10/187,640 has matured into U.S. Patent No. 6,973,579. Additional changes have been made to correct typographical errors. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (statutory double patenting) in view of the above amendments to claims 1-7. Applicants note that the amendments to claims 1-7 are being made in order to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 only, and not in response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) since, as discussed below and as was discussed during the interview, the language of originally filed claims 1-10 is distinguishable over Moon. As was also discussed during the interview, new

claims 11-18 are distinguished from the claims of the '579 patent so as to avoid a statutory double patenting rejection of new claims 11-18. And, as suggested by the Examiner during the interview, Applicants are filing concurrently herewith a terminal disclaimer in connection with the '579 patent to overcome any non-statutory (obviousness-type) double patenting rejection, should one be made by the Examiner in view of the currently pending claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of originally filed claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Moon. As discussed at the interview, the originally filed claims, unamended, distinguish over Moon in that Moon neither teaches nor suggests the claimed combination including a "High Speed Shared Control Channel" or "user equipment identification (UE ID)." The Examiner apparently acknowledged as much by noting that "[t]he Moon reference was explained as not being prior art because [M]oon uses a paging channel and a long code generator, whereas the instant application uses a High Speed Shared Control Channel and a user equipment ID." *See e.g.*, Interview Summary Continuation Sheet. Applicants submit that the currently pending claims are also allowable over Moon for at least the same reasons.


**Applicants:** Dick et al.  
**Application No.:** 10/779,431

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dick et al.

By



Jeffrey M. Glabicki  
Registration No. 42,584

Attachments: Terminal Disclaimer  
New Abstract

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-6400  
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499